



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

would pray with us without being asked. And, certainly, I think that if these holy spirits could know of the honour paid to them here, and how often they supplant their Blessed Master in the minds of men, they must be deeply pained; and certainly would not be more disposed to intercede on behalf of those thus dishonouring their Lord.

*M.* If they could know! And do you doubt their being able to know what passes here?

*F.* To be sure I doubt thing for which I have not a shadow of proof. What reason is there, for instance, to think that the Blessed Virgin can hear the innumerable prayers offered to her at the same time in thousands of places, all over the earth's surface. Is not this contrary to all reason? Is it not making her as omnipresent as God Himself?

*M.* I asked Father O'Driscoll once how this could be, and he said that this privilege had been given her by God at the time of her entrance into heaven.

*F.* And did this content you? or did you ask him how he found this out?

*M.* No; I suppose that is the doctrine of the Church.

*F.* Well, it is very singular, if she did get this privilege, that not a word should have been said about it in the Bible, and that no one in the Church should have suspected it for hundreds of years.

*M.* I cannot argue out of the Bible or the Fathers with one who has read so much more than I; but do you really think that the saints in heaven know nothing of what passes on earth? Why, how could they be happy if they were left in ignorance of the fate of those whom they loved on earth, whom they might have left in the midst of trials and dangers, and concerning whom they must long to know whether or not they have surmounted these?

*F.* I might as well ask you how they could be happy if they heard that their friends had *not* surmounted these dangers; or if, as we know must be often the case, they beheld those dear to them treading on the downward path that leads to destruction, and preparing for eternal separation from themselves and from God.

*M.* Oh, Frank, this argument in *your* mouth is hard to answer. I hardly dare to say that it would be for our mother's happiness to know what is passing on earth, when I think of the change that has taken place in you, except that I believe there is still a great happiness in store for her and for me, in your return to the faith.

*F.* My dearest child, I did not mean to make you cry; but I do feel that it was a merciful dispensation that she was spared the pain of seeing me take a step which at that time would have distressed her beyond measure; but which, I am assured, would appear to her in a very different light now, if she could know of it. But as to the question you have raised as to the happiness of the blessed: I know not that we have a right to suppose that anything can be wanting to the happiness of those who are in the presence of the Lord; and, surely, their resignation to His will must be so perfect, and their trust in Him so complete, that they will be content to leave all earthly matters in His hands.

*M.* I should like, however, to hear what you say to that other question, of which I have often thought, and especially lately: how can one be happy in Heaven if one dear to them were lost for eternity?

*F.* It is, indeed, a painful question; yet we know that earthly love will at length give way, if lavished on an object who has repeatedly proved himself unworthy of it. Kindness over and over again repaid with ingratitude, unfeeling selfishness, baseness of disposition, will weary out love at last. Well; no one can be lost who has not wearied out a love far surpassing in tenderness the purest earthly love. I suppose we may believe that long before the love of the Redeemer can abandon any one, or give him over to a reprobate mind, the love of those who on earth best loved that lost one will have been changed into indignation at the despite done unto a Saviour still dearer to them. Yes, it seems that the only way in which we can conceive of the happiness of the blessed is believing that their union with their Saviour's will and their concern for His glory are stronger feelings with them than any earthly love. And, if we weigh this, it makes us see, I think, how little we should gain by praying to the saints, instead of to Christ, and how little it is to be expected that they would be willing to receive us, supposing that His love was exhausted, and that He were unwilling Himself to receive our petitions.

*M.* It may be so; but I do not feel that I can talk any more controversy now.

*F.* I feel that too; but if you will promise me to read your Douay Testament I shall feel that this would be better than any controversy in bringing you to agree with me.

*M.* Surely, I remember many texts being quoted in defence of the intercession of the saints.

*F.* I hardly know what these texts are; but I don't think so much of the effect produced by one particular text or two, as of the whole tenor of the book. I really cannot remember a single passage directing us to ask the prayers of the Virgin and the saints; and when I think how impossible it would be to use such prayers without placing over confidence in them, I can see good reason why it should be so. The whole book sends us directly to Christ, as our only hope, our only confidence.

Ever since I have made that book my daily food, and have made myself familiar with the character of our Blessed Lord there described, I feel it impossible to think of any one else as more loving or more compassionate than He, or more ready to hear and answer my prayers.

*M.* You know I am not ignorant of the Testament. But, I confess, ever since your perversion (for I must call it so) I have been afraid to open the book. And I know what Father O'Driscoll would say if I were to tell him I was reading it.

*F.* Well, I can't think that any man has a right to forbid you God's Word; but, at all events, I don't see why he should know. For though you think it right to confess your sins to him, it surely cannot be a sin to read God's Holy Word, in the translation approved by your Church, and bearing your archbishop's name.

*M.* Don't ask me to promise you now, Frank; but I am thankful that I have seen you, for I have accustomed myself to think of Protestants scarcely as worshipping the same God as ourselves. But I see now it is only your head that has gone astray, and that there is as much religion and love of God in your heart as ever.

*F.* If I were to tell you all, you would find that I never believed so little as during that last year when I was nominally a Catholic. But there is not time for this now. Give my love to dear Ellen and Catherine. Tell them you have seen me, and try to make them think as charitably and affectionately of me as you do.

### Correspondence.

#### "DO THIS IN REMEMBRANCE OF ME."

—LUKE, XXII., 19.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR,—The text which I have placed at the head of my letter is one the right understanding of which must be owned to be very important. The Church of Rome teaches that by these few words our Lord ordained as priests his apostles who were then present, gave them power to transubstantiate bread and wine into his body, and directed them to offer up that body as a sacrifice for the living and the dead. May I trespass on your space with a brief inquiry whether the words are capable of bearing this meaning.

First, then, do the words "do this" mean, offer Me up as a propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the living and the dead?

It is plain that the words "do this" mean "do what I have just done and am doing now," and that if our Lord were not at that time offering Himself up as propitiatory sacrifice, neither was He charging the apostles to do the same. Now, it must be remembered that the words in question were spoken on Thursday evening, the day before the crucifixion. If our Lord had on that evening already offered a sacrifice of infinite value as a propitiation for the sins of the living and the dead, then it would have been unnecessary that the sacrifice on the cross should have been offered on the next day. A few hours after these words "do this" were spoken, our Lord, in the agony at Gethsemane, wrestled in prayer with his Father. "If it be possible, let this cup pass from Me." Now we know that that cup of sorrow did *not* pass from Him; and since no prayer of Jesus could have been unheard, we may conclude with certainty that it was *not* possible that the salvation of the world could be otherwise accomplished. If we imagine such a case possible as that the Saviour, instead of praying, "Not my will, but Thine be done," had refused to drink the cup of suffering which his Father had placed in his hand, and had not become obedient unto death, even unto the death of the cross, who can venture to deny that the work of propitiation for sin would have been left unaccomplished, and that, notwithstanding that He had instituted the supper on the evening before? If, then, it must be owned that on Thursday evening the infinitely precious sacrifice of Christ's body for the sins of the world had not been yet offered, He was not then offering that sacrifice, and by the words "do this" He could not have directed his apostles to do what He was not doing Himself.

Secondly, by these words "do this" did our Lord mean, "make my body?" If He did, it follows that our Lord on that occasion made the bread and wine into his own literal body, that with his own hands He took up his own body, broke it, and gave it to his disciples. Monstrous as this conclusion is, the Church of Rome has not shrank from it. I copy the following words, which have already appeared in your paper, vol. iv., p. 127, quoted from Mr. Faber's work on the Sacrament, and describing our Lord's own communion on that Thursday evening: "The incarnate Lord received Himself incarnate, was held in his own hands, lay upon his own tongue, descended into his own heart, by the most real reality on earth, his own real presence in the Blessed Eucharist."—Faber, p. 477. Surely, if anything so startling as this had taken place the sacred writers would have explicitly mentioned something about it; yet Roman Catholics have no option but either to adopt the monstrous doctrine stated by Mr. Faber or else to admit that our Lord did not turn the bread and wine into his own natural flesh and blood, and, therefore, to be forced to own that the words "do this" gave no such power to his apostles.

Further he says, "*Do this in remembrance of me.*"

Now, *remembrance* is not compatible with actual bodily presence. A friend *going away* may, on taking leave of you, ask you to remember him, but he would not ask you to remember him at the moment that he was promising to come to you. Who can believe that the words, "do this," mean bring me bodily into your presence *in remembrance of me*?

I think it is certain that any man who reads the narrative, without having any theory to support, but just satisfied to take the words in their plain meaning, can put no interpretation but one on our Lord's words "Do this in remembrance of me"—that is to say, Do what you have seen Me do. Take bread, break it, and bless it: then distribute it among yourselves and eat it: and so likewise with the wine, and this all is to be done in remembrance of Me.

I conclude, then, that the Eucharist is a commemoration of the sacrifice of Christ. But as Jesus was Himself alive when He instituted the ordinance, and as He did not then offer up Himself as a sacrifice on the cross, or hold in his own hands his own crucified body; so we have no ground for believing that we are commanded to offer Him up afresh, or that we are to expect to feed carnally upon his natural flesh and blood. His body has been offered up once for all, a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice. We may plead the remembrance of that sacrifice before God; may tell it out to the world: may believe that while we eat the symbols with our mouths we feed upon the Saviour in our spirits: but we have no warrant to believe, and we could find no greater comfort in believing, that Christ was to be really sacrificed every day, and his very flesh and blood to be eaten and drunk by our bodily mouths.

Yours, &c.,

R. H. B.

### ON THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR,—Might I beg your insertion of a few remarks, intended as supplementary to those in my letter on the Sacrifice of the Mass, published in your last number. I trust it is not necessary to apologize for trespassing again on your valuable space on a subject so important, and deserving the strictest investigation. In the letter referred to, I proved, I hope, satisfactorily, that the sacrificial act in the Mass, being unbloody, could not be propitiatory, because, "without shedding of blood is no remission." Roman Catholic writers feel this difficulty; and to extricate themselves from it, have recourse to certain explanations and arguments, which also I examined at some length. They admit the Mass has no propitiatory virtue in itself, and that it derives all it has only from its connection with the Sacrifice on the Cross. They maintain, then, of course, that there is such a connection, and endeavour to prove it. They assert that the Mass is the application to the souls of the faithful of the fruits of the Sacrifice on the Cross. They assert, and also endeavour to prove, that the Sacrifice in the Mass and that on the Cross are one and the same. As to the former—that is the doctrine of *application*—I have nothing at present to add to what I said in my former letter. As to the latter position, that the two sacrifices are one and the same, I brought forward various arguments to show they could not be so—the one was bloody; the other is unbloody; in the one, there was suffering and death; in the other, there is neither. I showed that the offering priests in both were essentially different—that the times also were different; the one sacrificial act was performed and finished 1800 years ago; the others, as they are many, nay innumerable, may be performed to-day or to-morrow, or a year or years hence, as they have been years past; and what I wish to add at present is, that the same may be said with regard to *place* as well as *time*: the one sacrifice was offered up near Jerusalem; the others are in thousands of different *places*, and under thousands of different and opposite circumstances; and we ask how can they be the same, when there are so many essential points of dissimilarity and contrariety as all those I have enumerated, and more besides. There is, nevertheless, an answer given (a very convenient one, I may add, for getting rid of difficulties and troublesome arguments), and that is, that the doctrine is a *mystery*. Now, I would not wish to utter a syllable that would be calculated in the slightest degree to lessen the reverence every one should feel for *revealed* mysteries. God forbid. But to attempt to show by reasons and arguments that the sacrifices are the same; and when these are met by counter reasons and arguments, and proved insufficient, it seems scarcely fair then to reply that the subject is a mystery. To escape the force of certain opposing passages of Scripture, they have recourse to many explanations and ingenuities of defensive reasonings; but when hard pressed in turn by stronger reasonings, they take refuge in mystery. Waiting, however, any further consideration of this, let us test the soundness of the answer. In doing so, I maintain, in the first place, what I think is nearly self-evident, that the truth of a mystery, even above that of other propositions or doctrines, should be established by sufficient evidence. A great structure should not be erected on a narrow and shallow foundation. Thus, when the pretensions and claims in any case are great, they ought to be sustained by sufficient credentials; in like manner, where the mystery is great—so great as to stagger reason at every step—and when the practical consequences also built on this mystery are of such magnitude, it is not unreasonable to require it should be supported by corresponding proofs. Are these to be had